DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 217 962 JC 820 342

AUTHOR Ostertag, Bruce A.; Baker, Ronald E.
TITLE A Report of the California Community College Learning Disabled Programs.
INSTITUTION California Community Colleges, Sacramento. Office of the Chancellor.
PUB DATE Jul 82
NOTE 67p.; May not reproduce well due to light print of the original document.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Community Colleges; *Diagnostic Tests; *Educational Diagnosis; *Handicap Identification; *Learning Disabilities; *Program Descriptions; Questionnaires; *Special Programs; State Surveys; Two Year Colleges; Two Year College Students
IDENTIFIERS *California

ABSTRACT

In spring 1982, a study was conducted of the programs and services for learning disabled average (LDA) students offered by California community colleges. The study sought to ascertain program characteristics, the means by which colleges identified adult students with specific learning disabilities, and the assessment tools used. Questionnaires were sent to and received from all 106 California community colleges. The study revealed: (1) 75% of the colleges operated formal LDA programs, while an additional 12% provided informal services; (2) the total LDA population served by these programs was 7,962 students; (3) most colleges used similar means for the identification and diagnosis of LDA students and delivered comparable services; (4) program similarities were evident in intake interviewing, referral procedures and agencies, assessment tools, personnel, counseling, and the availability of learning centers; and (5) individual education plans (IEP's) were maintained for over 98% of the LDA students assisted in formal programs. Study recommendations include the implementation of a defined identification and assessment approach, the development of consistent data-reporting methods, the creation of appropriate IEP's for students, and the adoption of a multi-disciplinary team approach for assessment and delivery of services. Appendices include lists of sites providing formal or informal LDA programs and sites without LDA services, and the survey instrument. (HB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED217962

A REPORT OF THE CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE LEARNING DISABLED PROGRAMS

Submitted By:

Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag
Assistant Professor of Special Education
College of Education
c/o California State University, Sacramento
6000 "J" Street
Sacramento, CA 95819

Dr. Ronald E. Baker
Coordinator/Enabler
Handicapped Student Services
c/o Mira Costa College
One Bernard Drive
Oceanside, CA 82054

Submitted To:

Mr. Robert Howard
State Specialist
Specially Funded Programs
c/o California Community College
Chancellor's Office
1122 "S" Street
Sacramento, CA 95814

July, 1982

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bruce A. Ostertag

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☒ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

JC 820 342

ABSTRACT

The California Community Colleges were sent a questionnaire pertaining to services for learning disabled students. One-hundred percent (106 total colleges) responded to the survey questions concerning the areas of LDA program characteristics, identification, and assessment tools. Over 75 percent of the community colleges operated formal programs while an additional twelve percent provided informal services for their LDA student population.

Though diversity existed among the college LDA programs surveyed, a consistency of process and practice was evident. Most colleges provided similar means for the identification and diagnosis of potential LDA students and in the support services delivered. More specifically, LDA programming similarities were demonstrated in: intake interviewing; referral procedures and agencies; assessment tools; personnel; counseling; and in the availability of a learning center.

Based upon the models provided by several of the California Community Colleges, recommendations were made for others who wish to implement LDA programming at the post-secondary level. The recommendations suggested the establishment and adoption of: 1) a defined identification and assessment approach, I.E.P. development, and delivery system; 2) collection of assessment data on all students which measures discrepancy; 3) appropriate, valid, and reliable assessment instruments; 4) I.E.P.'s which indicate assessment data, discrepancy, needs, goals, and programming methodology; 5) a multidisciplinary team approach to assessment, I.E.P. development, and delivery systems; 6) consistent data reporting methods securely maintained; confidentiality of material; and 8) in-service programming.

A follow-up study is to be completed by Spring, 1983 comparing and contrasting this report with ideal LDA program implementations as indicated by the respondents.

CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	1
Need for the Study	3
The Problem	3
Statement of the Problem	3
Assumptions of the Study	4
Limitations	4
Methodology	5
Results	5
Respondent Characteristics	5
Program Characteristics	6
Identification	10
Assessment Tools	12
Discussion and Recommendations	12
Summary	14
Selected Bibliography	16
Appendix A - Additional Tables	19
Appendix B - Questionnaire	26
Appendix C - Formal LDA Program Sites	40
Appendix D - Informal LDA Program Sites	43
Appendix E - Sites Without LDA Services	45

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		PAGE
1.	Programs at Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students	5
2.	Means by which Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students were academically assisted in California Community Colleges.	7
3.	Means by which Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students were academically assisted as reported by Community Colleges with formal LDA programs. .	8
4.	Additional adjustments implemented to aid students in Learning Disabled (LDA) formal and informal programs	9
5.	Referral by individuals or agencies of potential candidates for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.	11
6.	Tests used in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification or assessment purposes	13
7.	Population of Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students experiencing difficulty in academic skills.	20
8.	Estimated percentage of Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students receiving an Associate Degree, Vocational Certificate, transferring or expecting to transfer to a 4-year college or university . .	20
9.	Formal Multidisciplinary Team conference held to determine student admission in Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.	21
10.	Primary members of Multidisciplinary Team when considering potential candidates for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs	21
11.	Formal Multidisciplinary Team conferences held to develop Learning Disabled Average (LDA) student Individualized Education Program (I.E.P.)	22

TABLE PAGE

12. Primary members of Multidisciplinary Team when developing Individual Education Program (I.E.P.) for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students. . . 22

13. Active Individual Education Programs (I.E.P.) maintained for students in Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs. 23

14. In-service training provided for community college faculty and staff 23

15. Intake interviews conducted on potential students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs. . . 23

16. Acceptance of assessment results from other agencies for placement of students into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs 24

17. Formal assessments administered to potential candidates for acceptance into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs. 24

18. Areas in which informal tests are used to identify students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs. 25

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE
LEARNING DISABLED PROGRAMS REPORT

Introduction

This report contains specific information about the statewide research project conducted by Dr. Bruce A. Ostertag and Dr. Ronald E. Baker. The research team was also assisted by Ms. Laural Best and Mr. Robert F. Howard in the development, dissemination and description of the project. The study sought answers regarding California's community colleges and: (1) the organization of programs for learning disabled students; (2) the identification and assessment of the learning disabled students; and (3) the methodologies utilized with learning disabled students.

Following an initial review of literature pertaining to post-secondary education for the learning disabled, it was discovered that no specific study had been completed and published addressing the proposed research items. The Chancellor's Office of the California Community Colleges, as well as other organizations and authors, have published recommended assessment instruments or recommended methods. However, no study has identified which assessment instruments or methods are actually being utilized. This study identifies and reports, using descriptive statistics, charts, a questionnaire and narration the methods and assessment instruments presently being used by personnel working with learning disabled students in California Community Colleges.

Background

Identified adults with specific learning disabilities are a relatively new phenomenon in post-secondary education. Their participation in college is requiring a reevaluation of the types of programs and services offered in all segments

of post-secondary education. Dr. Barbara Cordoni (1982) noted there is a minimum of such programming and services nationwide. However, this is not altogether true in California where the Community Colleges have been providing extensive services for the last five-to-seven years for students identified as having specific learning disabilities. The California State Universities and Universities of California have also provided services, though on a smaller scale, for the past several years. The purpose of this study was to describe research conducted in the California Community Colleges on existing programs and services for adults with learning disabilities. Under the label of Learning Disabled Average (LDA), these students are attending and receiving services in the majority of the community colleges.

The definition of Learning Disabled has undergone substantial refinement during the last half-decade in the California Community Colleges. The colleges no longer adhere to the identification and assessment models operating in the K-12 special education system, though post-secondary education does deal with many adults who have attended that system. The community college definition of LDA is still in a state of transition. Various colleges are now operating LDA programs under the definition guidelines developed by the California Association of Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled (CAPED), Learning Disabilities Division. As of this writing, the Community College Chancellor's Office is considering the adoption of the following CAPED draft:

> "A specific learning disability refers to disorders in which an individual exhibits a significant/severe discrepancy between the current level of developed intellectual abilities and academic performances despite regular instruction and educational opportunity, as currently measured by professionally recognized diagnostic procedures. Academic performance refers to achievement in the following areas: listening comprehension, oral expression, written expression, basic reading skills, reading comprehension, mathematical calculation and reasoning.

> Specific Learning Disabilities are often due to constitutional, genetic and/or neurological factors and are not primarily due to: visual or auditory sensory deficits, motor handicaps, severe emotional disturbance, environmental or economic disadvantage, cultural/language difference, or mental retardation (1982)."

Need for the Study

A study describing the "state of the art" in California Community College programs for L.D.A. students was necessary for reasons of accountability and program improvement. Inconsistencies in programming throughout the state have led to confusion and, in some few cases, charges of non-compliance with state and chancellor office mandates. It was also feasible that programs could be in compliance with the law and yet not be providing appropriate education for their learning disabled students. A comprehensive description of present LDA programs would provide information which could be beneficial for the post-secondary LDA student. This study could lend itself as a resource for the Chancellor's Office, administrators of L.D.A. programs, specialists working with L.D.A. students, and college instructors of special education. Additionally, the accumulated data could serve as a possible reference point for future studies.

The Problem

The problem of this research was to identify and describe the programming used in California Community Colleges to meet the needs of students considered L.D.A. These programs were explored according to the areas of: characteristics, identification, and assessment tools.

Statement of the Problem

More specifically, the problem examined programming for L.D.A. students by determining answers to the following questions:

1. What organization characteristics were evident?
2. How were L.D.A. students identified?
3. What assessment tools were used for identification and diagnostic purposes?

Assumptions of the Study

Several basic assumptions formed the basis for the questions of this study. First, there was no official coordinated programming between community college districts in the areas of assessment strategies, content and priorities, and identification procedures for LDA programs. Second, the expertise of specialists working with LDA students was, generally, quite professional, but not all community colleges had specialists available in their programs. Many LDA students were being served by staff unfamiliar with and/or not certified in the area of learning disabilities. Third, though community college LDA programming was not coordinated statewide, there was a commonality of teaching techniques, tools, and administration. This assumption was based upon the belief that specialist-training through graduate-college coursework stressed somewhat similar instruction in this field. Most specialists of the LDA have been instructed with convergent methods, texts, and assessment tools.

Limitations

The following limitations should be taken into account in this study. In all cases, the usual error factors that occur in any research existed, such as inadvertent inaccuracies and misinterpretation of question content by respondents.

1. Personal interviews based upon a written questionnaire were used to collect a representative portion of the data.
2. A mailed questionnaire was used to collect the bulk of the data.
3. Other records, documents, and statistics were used to formulate this investigation.
4. The processing of the obtained data.
5. Learning disability theories are relatively new

and unproven. The lack of longitudinal studies to support these theories will limit the utility of this research.

Methodology

A questionnaire was developed and field tested through personal interviews. This selected group of college personnel examining the questionnaire indicated an understanding of the questions; therefore no significant item modifications were made.

With the clarity of the questionnaire confirmed, the questionnaire was mailed to all the public California Community Colleges. In total, 106 community colleges were contacted. The study was conducted during April and May, 1982.

Results

One-hundred-and-six colleges out of the total 106 participated in this study for a return of 100 percent. The Community College Chancellor's Office and CAPED assisted in obtaining the high return by requesting every college to respond.

Respondent Characteristics. Forty-one percent of the respondents identified themselves as Coordinator/Enabler of Handicapped Services. Twenty-seven percent identified themselves as an instructor in an LDA program and a like percentage indicated they were either psychologists, counselors, or other faculty.

TABLE 1: Programs at Community Colleges for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) Students.

Type of Program for LDA	Number of Colleges	Percent of Colleges	Number of LDA Students Served	Percent of LDA Students Served
Formal	80	75.4	7,631	95.8
Informal	13	12.3	331	4.2
None	13	12.3	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	7,962	100.0

Program Characteristics. Table 1 indicates the type and size of programming at California's Community Colleges for LDA students. Programs were designed as formal or informal. Formal programs were considered to have all those services offered to LDA students in an informal program plus: 1) an LDA specialist; 2) a standard, routine assessment procedure for each student; and 3) the option of running special classes. With these guidelines, eighty of the responding colleges said they had a formal program for identified LDA students. An additional thirteen colleges stated that they operated some type of service other than a formal program. Only thirteen of the respondent colleges did not serve LDA students in any capacity. Some 7,962 LDA students were receiving services in formal or informal programs through 88 percent of California's Community Colleges.

Identified LDA students had their educational needs met through a myraid of ways. College programs include special classes, tutorial support, counseling and other auxilliary services. Tables 2 and 3 illustrate that means by which LDA students were assisted. Tutorial services were delivered primarily through one-to-one settings by an aide in the LDA program, the LDA specialist, or a peer tutor. Counseling was also handled through a one-to-one setting in academic, career and personal areas under the direction of the LDA program or external programs.

Additional adjustments implemented to aid students in LDA programs are shown on Table 4. Over ninety percent of participating formal LDA programs delivered diagnostic learning assessments, registration services, and a learning center available for their LDA student's remediation needs. Seventy-five percent or more also offered services for lecture reproduction and comprehension, reader and notetaker support. Class schedule modifications and revised course curriculums were given by more than sixty percent of the formal LDA programs. The responses by informal LDA programs were fairly consistent with their formal counterparts.

Individual Education Plans (IEP's) were maintained on over ninety-eight percent of assisted LDA students in formal programs. Multidisciplinary Teams were not required by administrative regulations to develop an IEP's at the post-secondary level. When asked whether they used a team con-

TABLE 2: Means by which Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students were academically assisted in California Community Colleges.

	One-to-One		In Group		In Class	
A. Tutorial Support	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]
LDA Specialist	59	(55.7)	47	(44.3)	42	(39.6)
Peer Tutor	55	(51.9)	33	(31.1)	18	(17.0)
Aide	71	(67.0)	51	(48.1)	40	(37.7)
Other Faculty	25	(23.5)	14	(13.2)	25	(23.6)
B. Counseling Internal to LDA Program						
Academic	80	(75.8)	16	(15.1)	14	(13.2)
Personal	74	(69.8)	22	(20.8)	17	(16.0)
Career	76	(71.7)	28	(26.4)	29	(27.4)
C. Counseling External to LDA Program						
Academic	75	(70.8)	17	(16.0)	18	(17.0)
Personal	71	(67.0)	18	(17.0)	25	(23.6)
Career	72	(67.9)	28	(26.4)	42	(39.6)

[a]More than one response permitted.

[b]Based upon 106 respondents. Eighty-eight responses were valid with 18 responses missing.

TABLE 3: Means by which Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students were academically assisted, as reported by community colleges with formal LDA programs.

	One-to-One		In Group		In Class	
A. Tutorial Support	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]	Frequency[a]	(Percent)[b]
LDA Specialist	59	(73.8)	47	(58.8)	41	(51.3)
Peer Tutor	51	(63.8)	31	(38.8)	16	(20.0)
Aide	68	(85.0)	50	(62.5)	36	(45.0)
Other Faculty	22	(27.5)	12	(15.0)	23	(28.8)
B. Counseling Internal to LDA Program						
Academic	77	(96.3)	16	(20.0)	13	(16.3)
Personal	70	(87.5)	22	(27.5)	16	(20.0)
Career	72	(90.0)	27	(33.8)	27	(33.8)
C. Counseling External to LDA Program						
Academic	68	(85.0)	16	(20.0)	18	(22.5)
Personal	64	(80.0)	18	(22.5)	25	(31.3)
Career	65	(81.3)	27	(33.8)	40	(50.0)

[a]More than one response permitted.

[b]Based upon 80 respondents. No responses missing.

TABLE 4: Additional adjustments implemented to aid students in Learning Disabled Average (LDA) formal and informal programs.

Adjustments	Formal Programs Number of Colleges[a]	Formal Programs Percent of Cases[b]	Informal Programs Number of Colleges[a]	Informal Programs Percent of Cases[c]
Learning Center Available for Remediation Needs	74	(92.5)	5	(55.6)
Arrangements for Lecture, Comprehension, Reproduction	68	(85.0)	7	(77.8)
Class Schedules Modified to meet related problems	51	(63.8)	3	(33.3)
Course Curriculum Revised	48	(60.0)	4	(44.4)
Extend time to complete individual Course Requirements	29	(36.3)	2	(22.2)
Waive or Extend time to complete Degree Requirements	19	(23.8)	2	(22.2)
Course Substitutions	6	(7.5)	1	(11.1)
Auxilliary Support Services:				
1. Reader	64	(80.0)	8	(88.9)
2. Notetaker Service	60	(75.0)	8	(88.9)
3. Registration Service	72	(90.0)	8	(88.9)
4. Diagnostic Learning Assessment	76	(95.0)	4	(44.4)
5. Other	63	(78.8)	5	(55.6)

[a]More than one response permitted.

[b]Based upon 80 respondents.

[c]Based upon 13 respondents.

ference for IEP development approximately twenty-one percent replied affirmatively, forty percent did not use teams, and thirty-eight percent occasionally utilized teams. When Multidisciplinary Team Conferences were employed the primary members were the LDA specialist, the involved student and a counselor.

In-service training was provided by the majority of formal program respondents for other faculty and staff. Over ninety-three percent of those replying offered this program component.

In terms of ranking academic skills by the difficulty experienced by their LDA population, the respondents listed reading as the most difficult. Writing and spelling followed as major academic areas of remediation need. Mathematics was listed next with Oral Communication ranked lowest in the hierarchy.

Appendix A lists various tables demonstrating the above narrations and additional graphics relevant to characteristics of LDA programming in California Community Colleges. Appendices C, D, and E list the college sites by formal, informal, or null programming for LDA students.

Identification: Several questionnaire items addressed the issue of identification. Respondents indicated that over ninety percent of the LDA referrals come from, in rank order: 1) Faculty; 2) Counselors; 3) High Schools; 4) Department of Rehabilitation; 5) Parents/Relatives; and 6) the LDA student themselves. Also, two other referral groups rated fairly high: Social Service Agencies and LDA Student Peers (see Table 5).

Intake Interviews were given by ninety-four percent of the respondents who operate a formal LDA program. An extra four percent occasionally held intake interviews with potential LDA students.

Following the above interviews, eighty-eight percent of the existing formal LDA programs accepted assessment results from other agencies for placement purposes. Standardized assessments were given by eighty-one percent of these programs

TABLE 5: Referral by individuals or agencies of potential candidates for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Agency or Individual	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency[a]	Percent[b]	Frequency[a]	Percent[c]
Faculty	86	81.1	79	98.8
High Schools	85	80.2	78	97.5
Department of Rehabilitation	85	80.2	78	97.5
Counselor	85	80.2	78	97.5
Parents/Relative	82	77.4	76	95.0
Self	81	76.4	77	96.3
Social Service Agency	64	60.4	60	75.0
Peers (of Students)	63	59.4	61	76.3
L.D. Specialist	58	54.7	57	71.3
Psychologist	47	44.3	46	57.5
College Placement Exam	43	40.6	39	48.8
Law Enforcement Agencies	23	21.7	22	27.5
Religious Institutions	10	9.4	10	12.5

[a]More than one response possible.

[b]Based upon 106 responses. Eighty-eight responses were valid with 18 responses missing.

[c]Based upon 80 responses. No missing responses.

to obtain further pertinent data. Additionally, fifteen percent said they sometimes gave these tests. Informal assessments were given by sixty-four respondents to complement the above testing practices. The most used informal test was a test of written language (see Table 18, Appendix A).

As with IEP's, Multidisciplinary Teams were not required when identifying and placing post-secondary LDA students in formal programs. Only twenty percent of those responding used teams for this purpose with another thirty-eight percent declaring the occasional usage of such teams. When teams were used, the primary members were the same as those who develop an I.E.P.: the LDA specialist, the LDA student, and a counselor. Student placement in the LDA programs was decided upon by informal team meetings, by the LDA specialist, or by the Coordinator/Enabler of the Handicapped Services.

Assessment Tools. Three formal assessment tools were used by more than seventy percent of those respondents who used testing instruments in a formal program. In rank-order, these three tests were: 1) Wide Range Achievement Test (W.R.A.T.); 2) Peabody Individual Achievement Test (P.I.A.T.); and 3) Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test-Revised (P.P.V.T.-R). Five additional tests were used by at least half of the respondents: 4) Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (D.T.L.A.); 5) Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery; 6) Wepman Auditory Scale-Revised (W.A.I.S.-R.); and 8) KeyMath. One test used by forty percent or more respondents was the : 9) Woodcock Reading Mastery Test. Table 5 lists these tests plus several others used by twenty-five percent or more of the respondents.

Discussion

The implementation and organization of LDA programs in California Community Colleges were diverse enough to meet the needs of their local areas, yet a definite consistency exists. Most colleges provided similar means for the identification and diagnosis of potential LDA students: intake interviewing, referring procedures and agencies, and a basic agreement as to assessment tool usage. Programs and support

TABLE 6: Tests used in twenty-five percent or more formal programs for the Learning Disabled Average (LDA) for identification or assessment purposes.

Test	Number of Colleges	Percent[a]
1. Wide Range Achievement Test (WRAT)	70	88.6
2. Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT)	58	73.4
3. Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Revised (PPVT-R)	58	73.4
4. Detroit Test of Learning Aptitude (DTLA)	48	60.8
5. Woodcock-Johnson Psychoeducational Test Battery	44	55.7
6. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test	43	54.4
7. Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R)	42	53.2
8. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test	40	50.6
9. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test	38	48.1
10. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test	31	39.2
11. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test	31	39.2
12. Spache Diagnostic Reading Scales	30	38.0
13. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory	30	38.0
14. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test	29	36.7
15. Raven-Progressive Matrix	27	34.2
16. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised	23	29.1
17. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Ability	22	27.8
18. Keystone Visual Screening Test	21	26.6

[a]Based upon 80 respondents.

services also demonstrated a consistency from college-to-college. These support services included: an LDA specialist, tutorial aide; a learning center; counseling in personal, career or academic areas; registration service; readers; notetakers; or equipment loan.

Based upon the survey results, the following recommendations are suggested for community colleges which serve students in an LDA program: 1) implementation of a defined identification and assessment approach, I.E.P. development and delivery system for all LDA students; 2) collection of assessment data on all students which measures and identifies a student's discrepancy; 3) adoption of appropriate, validated and reliable assessment tools; 4) implementation of IEP's which clearly indicate the assessment data, discrepancy, needs, goals and programming methods for working with said students; 5) adoption of a multidisciplinary team approach to the implementation of assessment, IEP development, and delivery systems for all LDA students; 6) collection of consistent data reporting methods securely maintained on the above material; 7) maintenance of confidentiality on the above material; and 8) implementation of active in-service programming for faculty, advisory board and community. It should be noted that the majority of California's Community Colleges currently adhere to the above recommendations.

A follow-up study dealing with opinions regarding model identification, assessment tools and LDA program organization, as indicated by the respondents on this report's questionnaire, will be completed Spring, 1983. This component of the study will compare and contrast the actual and desired implementation of LDA programs as expressed by the professional field.

Summary

The California Community Colleges were sent a questionnaire pertaining to services for learning disabled students. One-hundred percent (106 total colleges) responded to the survey questions concerning the areas of LDA program characteristics, identification, and assessment tools. Over 75 percent of the community colleges operated formal programs while an additional twelve percent provided informal services for their LDA student population.

Though diversity existed among the college LDA programs surveyed, a consistency of process and practice was evident. Most colleges provided similar means for the identification and diagnosis of potential LDA students and in the support services delivered. More specifically, LDA programming similarities were demonstrated in: intake interviewing; referral procedures and agencies, assessment tools; personnel; counseling; and in the availability of a learning center.

Based upon the models provided by several of the California Community Colleges, recommendations were made for others who wish to implement LDA programming at the post-secondary level. The recommendations suggested the establishment and adoption of: 1) a defined identification and assessment approach, I.E.P. development, and delivery system; 2) collection of assessment data on all students which measures discrepancy; 3) appropriate, valid, and reliable assessment instruments; 4) I.E.P.'s which indicate assessment data, discrepancy, needs, goals, and programming methodology; 5) a multidisciplinary team approach to assessment, I.E.P. development, and delivery systems; 6) consistent data reporting methods securely maintained; confidentiality of material; and 8) in-service programming.

A follow-up study is to be completed by Spring, 1983 comparing and contrasting this report with ideal LDA program implementations as indicated by the respondents.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alley, G. and Deshler, D. 1979. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent: strategies and methods. Denver, Colorado: Love Publishing.

California Association for Post-Secondary Educators of the Disabled. 1982. Unpublished report. California Community College Chancellor's Office. June, 1982.

California Community College Chancellor's Office. 1980. Learning disabilities handbook. Sacramento, California.

Clark, F. L. (ed.) 1981. "Major research findings of the University of Kansas institute for research in learning disabilities." Institute for research in learning disabilities research report No. 31. October, 1981.

Compton, C. 1980. A guide to 65 tests for special education. Belmont, California: Fearon Education/Pitman Learning, Inc.

Cordoni, B. 1982. "Post-secondary education: where do we go from here?" Journal of learning disabilities Vol. 15, No. 5, p. 265. May, 1982.

Cullinan, D. and Epstein, M. H. 1979. Special education for adolescents. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

McLoughlin, J. A. and Lewis, R. B. 1981. Assessing special students. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill.

Mann, L., Goodman, L. and Widerholt, P. H. 1978. Teaching the learning disabled adolescent. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Ostertag, B. A. and Schnorr, J. M. 1981. "Reading instruction in secondary learning disabled programs." Academic Therapy 17:2, pp. 163-169. November, 1981.

Swan, R. J. 1982. "A counseling model for promoting academic success of learning disabled students at the university level." Unpublished paper. California State University, Long Beach. February, 1982.

Swanson, H. L. and Watson, B. L. 1982. Educational and psychological assessment of exceptional children. St. Louis: C. V. Mosby.

Weller, C. and Strawser, S. 1980. "Detecting learning disabilities in the college-age student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 3, Spring, 1980.

Ysseldyke, J. E. and Algozzine, B. 1979. "Perspectives on assessment of learning disabled student." Learning disability quarterly. Volume 2, Fall, 1979.

APPENDIX A

ADDITIONAL TABLES

TABLE 7: Estimated population of Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students experiencing difficulty in academic skills.

Academic Skill	Total Community College	Formal LDA Program
	Frequency of LDA Students[a]	Frequency of LDA Students[b]
Reading	4,644	4,474
Spelling	3,269	3,234
Writing	3,233	3,146
Mathematics	2,515	2,427
Oral Communication	1,066	1,049

[a]Based upon 106 respondents.

[b]Based upon 80 respondents.

TABLE 8: Estimated percentage of Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students receiving an Associate Degree, Vocational Certificate, trasnferring or expecting to transfer to a four-year college or university.

	Total Community College Percent[a]	Formal LDA Program Percent[b]
Associate Degree	5.1	4.3
Vocational Certificate	8.1	7.4
Actually Transferred to a four-year college	3.1	2.3
Expecting to transfer to a four-year college	11.6	10.9

[a]Based upon 106 responses. Sixty-six responses were valid with 40 responses missing.

[b]Based upon 80 responses. Sixty responses were valid with 20 responses missing.

TABLE 9: Formal Multidisciplinary Team conference held to determine student admission into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Conferences Held	Total Community Colleges Frequency	Total Community Colleges Percent	Formal LDA Programs Frequency	Formal LDA Programs Percent
Yes	16	15.1	16	20.0
No	38	35.8	32	40.0
Sometimes	32	30.2	30	37.5
Missing Responses	20	18.9	2	2.5
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 10: Primary members of Multidisciplinary Team when considering potential candidates for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Members	Total Community Colleges Frequency[a]	Total Community Colleges Percent[b]	Formal LDA Programs Frequency[a]	Formal LDA Programs Percent[b]
LDA Specialist	35	33.0	35	43.8
Counselor	29	27.4	28	35.0
Student	25	23.6	24	30.0
Enabler/College Specialist	23	21.7	22	27.5
Speech & Language Therapist	17	16.0	17	21.3
Other Faculty	14	13.2	13	16.3
Psychologist	13	12.3	13	16.3
Parent/Relative	12	11.3	11	13.8
Social Worker	4	3.8	3	3.8
Medical Doctor	1	0.9	1	1.3

[a]More than one response possible.

[b]Based upon 106 responses. Forty-three responses were valid with 63 missing.

[c]Based upon 80 responses. Forty-two responses were valid with 38 missing.

TABLE 11: Formal Multidisciplinary Team conferences held to develop Learning Disabled Average (LDA) student Individualized Education Program (I.E.P.).

Conferences Held	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	17	16.0	17	21.3
No	36	34.0	32	40.0
Sometimes	34	32.1	30	37.5
Missing Responses	19	17.9	1	1.3
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 12: Primary members of Multidisciplinary Team when developing Individual Education Program (I.E.P.) for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) students.

Members	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency[a]	Percent[a]	Frequency[a]	Percent[c]
LDA Specialist	37	34.9	37	34.9
Student	37	34.9	36	34.9
Counselor	27	25.5	27	25.5
Enabler/College Specialist	17	16.0	17	16.0
Other Faculty	17	16.0	17	16.0
Speech & Language Therapist	14	15.1	14	15.1
Parent/Relative	11	10.4	11	10.4
Psychologist	6	5.6	6	5.6
Social Worker	5	4.7	5	4.7
Medical Doctor	1	0.9	1	0.9

[a]More than one response possible.

[b]Based upon 106 responses. Forty-four responses were valid with 62 responses missing.

[c]Based upon 80 responses. Forty-three responses were valid with 37 responses missing.

TABLE 13: Active Individual Education Programs (I.E.P.) maintained for students in Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Programs Actively Maintained	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	80	75.5	78	97.5
No	7	6.6	1	1.3
Missing Responses	19	17.9	1	1.3
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 14: In-service training provided for community college faculty and staff.

In-Service Training Provided	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	78	73.6	74	92.5
No	7	6.6	3	3.8
Missing Responses	21	19.8	3	3.8
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 15: Intake interviews conducted on potential students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Intake Interviews Conducted	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	80	75.5	75	93.8
No	3	2.8	2	2.5
Sometimes	5	4.7	3	3.8
Missing Responses	18	17.0	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 16: Acceptance of assessment results from other agencies for placement of students into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Acceptance of Assessment	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	76	71.7	70	87.5
No	11	10.4	9	11.3
Missing Responses	19	17.9	1	1.3
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 17: Formal assessments administered to potential candidates for acceptance into Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Formal Assessments Administered	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency	Percent	Frequency	Percent
Yes	66	67.3	65	81.3
No	8	7.5	3	3.8
Sometimes	15	14.2	12	15.0
Missing Responses	17	16.0	0	0.0
Total	106	100.0	80	100.0

TABLE 18: Areas in which informal tests are used to identify students for Learning Disabled Average (LDA) programs.

Areas	Total Community Colleges		Formal LDA Programs	
	Frequency[a]	Percent[b]	Frequency[a]	Percent[c]
Written Language	59	55.7	55	68.8
Reading	36	34.5	32	40.0
Arithmetic	34	32.1	30	37.5
Specific Learning Abilities/Modalities	29	27.4	27	33.8
Classroom Behavior	29	27.4	27	33.8
Spelling	27	25.5	25	31.3
Overall Achievement	25	23.6	24	30.0
Spoken Language	24	22.6	24	30.0
Intellectual Performance/ Adaptive Behavior	18	17.0	17	21.3

[a]More than one response permitted.

[b]Based upon 106 responses. Seventy responses were valid with 36 responses missing.

[c]Based upon 80 responses. Sixty-four responses were valid with 16 responses missing.

APPENDIX B

QUESTIONNAIRE

Code No. _____

COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND THE LEARNING DISABLED: QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to all items

1) Title of Respondent (Please check the one that best applies):

1. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Instructor)
2. /__/ Learning Disability Specialist (Coordinator, L.D. Program)
3. /__/ Coordinator/Enabler/College Specialist (Total Handicapped Services)
4. /__/ Psychologist
5. /__/ Counselor
6. /__/ Aide
7. /__/ Other Faculty (identify) _____

2) Does your school have a formal program for Learning Disabled (L.D.) college students?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Other (identify)_____

3) Indicate the NUMBER of L.D. served. /_____/

4) Indicate the NUMBER of potential L.D. students on your campus who are not receiving services. /_____/

If you are not serving any L.D. students, please stop here and return the questionnaire in the stamped, addressed envelope. Other, please continue.

5) Indicate the NUMBER of L.D. students experiencing primary academic difficulty in the following skills:

1. /__/ Reading
2. /__/ Math
3. /__/ Writing
4. /__/ Oral Communication
5. /__/ Spelling
6. /__/ Other (describe)_____

6) In the past three years, approximately:

1. What percentage of students served by your L.D. program have obtained A.A. degrees? /____%/
2. What percentage of students served by your L.D. program have obtained vocational certificates? /____%/
3. What percentage of students being served by your L.D. program expect to transfer to four-year colleges or universities? /____%/
4. What percentage of students being served by your L.D. program have actually transferred to four-year colleges or universitites? /____%/

27

7) How is a student initially referred as a possible candidate for the L.D. program? Please check any of the below which are appropriate.

1. /__/ Faculty
2. /__/ Counselor
3. /__/ L.D. Specialist
4. /__/ Psychologist
5. /__/ Parents/Relatives
6. /__/ High Schools
7. /__/ Law Enforcement Agencies
8. /__/ Department of Rehabilitation
9. /__/ Social Service Agency
10. /__/ Religious Institutions
11. /__/ Peers (of student)
12. /__/ College Placement Exam
13. /__/ Self
14. /__/ Other (describe)_____

8) Are Formal Assessments administered by your college L.D. program to potential students?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

9) Do you use assessment results from referring agencies for student placement purposes into your program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No

If you responded "Yes," please list those agencies:

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____
4. _____
5. _____
6. _____
7. _____
8. _____
9. _____
10. _____

10) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student admission to your L.D. Program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team. (Example: 7. /2/ Counselor).

1. /__/ Student
2. /__/ Parent/Relative
3. /__/ Psychologist
4. /__/ L.D. Specialist
5. /__/ Enabler/College Specialist
6. /__/ Speech and Language Therapist
7. /__/ Counselor
8. /__/ Social Worker
9. /__/ Medical Doctor
10. /__/ Other Faculty
11. /__/ Other (describe)_____
12. /__/ Other (describe)_____

11) Are Formal Multidisciplinary Team Conferences held to determine student Individualized Education Programs (I.E.P's)?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No 3. /__/ Sometimes

If you responded "Yes," please indicate the Primary members and numbers of each who belong to the team (Example: 3. /1/ Psychologist).

1. /__/ Student
2. /__/ Parent/Relative
3. /__/ Psychologist
4. /__/ L.D. Specialist
5. /__/ Enabler/College Specialist
6. /__/ Speech and Language Therapist
7. /__/ Counselor
8. /__/ Social Worker
9. /__/ Medical Doctor
10. /__/ Other Faculty
11. /__/ Other (describe)_____
12. /__/ Other (describe)_____

12) Do you maintain an active Individualized Education Program (IEP) for all students receiving services in your L.D. program?

1. /__/ Yes 2. /__/ No

13) In what ways does your program academically assist L.D. students? Please check any of the below which apply?

A. TUTORIAL SUPPORT:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. L.D. Specialist			
2. Peer-Adult			
3. Aide			
4. Other Faculty			

B. COUNSELING INTERNAL TO THE L.D. PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

13) Continued

C. COUNSELING EXTERNAL TO THE L.D. PROGRAM:	One-to-One	In Groups	In Class
1. Academic			
2. Personal			
3. Career			

14) Indicate any of the below additional adjustments implemented by your program/college to aid the L.D.:

1. /____/ Length of time permitted to complete degree requirements waived or extended.
2. /____/ Length of time permitted to complete individual course requirements extended.
3. /____/ Substitutions permitted in course requirements (Example: substituting special remedial course for Introductory English).
4. /____/ Auxiliary support services provided for students to assist in keeping up with educational demands.

   Check those support services you provide:

   a. /__/ Reader Services
   b. /__/ Notetaker Services
   c. /__/ Registration Assistance
   d. /__/ Diagnostic Learning Assessment
   e. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   f. /__/ Other (describe)_____
   g. /__/ Other (describe)_____

5. /____/ Revising required course curriculum (Example: Eliminating term paper in favor of taped project). Identify_____
   _____
6. /____/ Arrangements available for notetakers or other methods of reproducing lecture texts. Identify_____
   _____
7. /____/ Learning Center available to provide appropriate remediation for students in reading, math, study skills, etc.
8. /____/ Classes scheduled to meet problems related to physical or emotional disability, or other special needs

14) Continued

9. /___/ Other (identify)_____

15) Do you provide in-service training for college faculty and staff?

1. /___/ Yes 2. /___/ No

16) Check any of the below areas in which Informal Tests (Teacher-made or College-developed) are used to identify L.D. students.

1. /___/ Over-all Achievement
2. /___/ Classroom Behavior
3. /___/ Reading
4. /___/ Spoken Language
5. /___/ Written Language
6. /___/ Intellectual Performance/Adaptive Behavior
7. /___/ Specific Learning Abilities/Modalities
8. /___/ Arithmetic
9. /___/ Spelling
10. /___/ Other (identify)_____

17) Do you conduct an Intake Interview with prospective students for the L.D. program?

1. /___/ Yes 2. /___/ No 3. /___/ Sometimes

18) Please identify any of the below tests used regularly (more than 50% of the time) to diagnose L.D. students. Check the appropriate "Purpose" and "Evaluator" for each test given:

PURPOSE											EVALUATOR					
Achievement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational	TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
											1. AAMD Adaptive Behavior Scale-Public School Version (1975						
											2. Adaptive Behavior Inventory For Children (1977)						
											3. Adult Base Learning Exam/ABLE (1978)						
											4. Behavior Rating Profile (1978)						
											5. Bender Visual-Motor Gestalt Test (1938)						
											6. Botel Reading Inventory (1978)						
											7. Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Basic Skills (1977)						
											8. Brigance Diagnostic Inventory of Essential Skills (1978)						
											9. Bruininks-Oseretsky Test of Motor Proficiency (1978)						
											10. Burks' Behavior Rating Scales (1977)						
											11. Carrow Elicited Language Inventory (1974)						
											12. Classroom Reading Inventory/Silvaroli (1976)						

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR					
Achievement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
												13. Clinical Evaluation of Language Functions (1980)						
												14. Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (1981)						
												15. Detroit Tests of Learning Aptitude (1978)						
												16. Developmental Test of Visual-Motor Integration (1967)						
												17. Diagnostic Reading Scales/Spache (1972)						
												18. Diagnostic Test and Self-Help in Arithmetic (1975)						
												19. Diagnostic Word Patterns (1978)						
												20. Dolch Basic Sight Word Test-Revised (1976)						
												21. Draw-A-Man (1976)						
												22. Draw-A-Person (1976)						
												23. Durnell Analysis of Reading Difficulty (1955)						
												24. FIRO-B (1976)						
												25. Forer Structured Sentence Completion Test (1976)						
												26. Frostig Developmental Test of Visual Perception (1966)						
												27. Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test (1978)						

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR					
Achievement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
												28. Gates-McKillop Reading Diagnostic Test (1962)						
												29. Gates-Russell Spelling Diagnostic Test (1940)						
												30. Gilmore Oral Reading Test (1968)						
												31. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Auditory Skills Battery (1976)						
												32. Goldman-Fristoe-Woodcock Test of Auditory Discrimination (1970)						
												33. Gray Oral Reading Test (1967)						
												34. Houston Test for Language Development (1963)						
												35. Illinois Test of Psycholinguistic Abilities/ITPA (1968)						
												36. KeyMath Diagnostic Mathematics Test (1973)						
												37. Keystone Vision Screening (1976)						
												38. Lindamood Auditory Conceptualization Test/LAC (1971)						
												39. Malcomesius Specific Language Disability Test (1967)						
												40. Mecham Verbal Language Development Scale (1959)						

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR					
Achelvement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
											41.	Mooney Problem Checklists (1950)						
											42.	Motor-Free Visual Perception Test (1972)						
											43.	Peabody Individual Achievement Test/PIAT (1970)						
											44.	Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test Revised (1980)						
											45.	Picture Story Language Test/PSLT (1965)						
											46.	Progressive Matrics-Raven (1975)						
											47.	Purdue Perceptual-Motor Survey (1966)						
											48.	Reading Miscue Inventory (1978)						
											49.	Road Map Test (1976)						
											50.	Roswell-Chall Diagnostic Test of Word Analysis Skills (1976)						
											51.	Sequential Tests of Education Progress (1963)						
											52.	Slosson Intelligence Test/SIT (1975)						
											53.	Southern California Kinesthesia & Tactile Perception Tests/Ayres (1972)						
											54.	SRA Math Probes (1973)						
											55.	Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scale (1973)						

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR					
Achelvement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
												56. Stanford Diagnostic Mathematics Test (1976)						
												57. Steenburgen Quick Math Screening Test (1978)						
												58. Strong-Campbell Interest Inventory (1981)						
												59. Sucher-Allred Reading Placement Inventory (1973)						
												60. System Fore (1979)						
												61. System for Multicultural Pluralistic Assessment (1977)						
												62. Test of Adolescent Language/TAL (1980)						
												63. Test of Auditory Comprehension of Language-Carrow (1973)						
												64. Test of Language Development/TOLD (1977)						
												65. Test of Reading Comprehension/TORC (1978)						
												66. Test of Written Language/TOWL (1978)						
												67. Test of Written Spelling/TOWS (1976)						
												68. Visual Aural Digit Span Test/VADS (1977)						
												69. Vineland Social Maturity Scale/VSMS (1965)						
53												70. Wecnsler Adult Intelligence Scale Revised/WAIS-R (1980)					54	

18) Continued

PURPOSE												TESTS (Arranged in Alphabetical Order)	EVALUATOR					
Achievement	Classroom Behavior	Reading	Intellectual Performance Adaptive Behavior	Perceptual Motor	Arithmetic	Spoken Language	Written Language	Visual Perception	Auditory Perception	Vocational			L.D. Specialist	Aide	Psychologist	Faculty	Counselor	Other
												71. Wechsler Memory Scale (1980)						
												72. Wepman Auditory Discrimination Test (1975)						
												73. Wide Range Achievement Test/WRAT (1978)						
												74. Woodcock-Johnson Psycho-Educational Battery (1977)						
												75. Woodcock Reading Mastery Test (1973						
												76. Other (identify)_____						
												77. Other (identify)_____						
												78. Other (identify)_____						
												79. Other (identify)_____						
												80. Other (identify)_____						

19) What do you believe should be the minimum assessment procedures and tools utilized to identify potential L.D. students for placement purposes? Please list, in priority order, the minimum procedures and tests that should be used. You need not respond to every possible item blank.

A. Identification Procedure (Intake Interview, Checklists, etc.)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

B. Assessment Tools (Formal and Informal Tests)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

C. Multi-disciplinary Team Members (Testing)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

D. Multi-disciplinary Team Members (Placement)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

19) Continued

E. Multi-Disciplinary Team Members (I.E.P. Development)

1. _____ 6. _____
2. _____ 7. _____
3. _____ 8. _____
4. _____ 9. _____
5. _____ 10. _____

20) Please list any additional comments: _____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE. PLEASE RETURN THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE IMMEDIATELY IN THE ACCOMPANYING, STAMPED ENVELOPE.

APPENDIX C

FORMAL LDA PROGRAM SITES

FORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA STUDENTS IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES[a]

Alameda, College of
Allan Hancock College
Antelope Valley College
Bakersfield College
Butte College
Cabrillo College
Canada College
Canyons, College of
Cerritos College
Cerro Coso Community College
Chabot College
Chaffey College
Citrus College
Coastline
Columbia Junior College
Compton Community College
Contra Costa College
Crafton Hills College
Cuesta College
Cuyamaca College
Cypress College
De Anza College
Desert, College of
Diablo Valley College
El Camino College
Evergreen
Foothill College
Fresno City College
Fullerton College
Gavilan College
Glendale College
Grossmont College
Imperial Valley College
Indian Valley College
Lake Tahoe Community College
Lassen College
Long Beach City College
Los Angeles City College
Los Angeles Harbor College
Los Angeles Mission College

(Continued on next page)

---

[a]Formal Programs are defined as having:

(1) an LDA Specialist;

(2) a standard, routine assessment procedure for each student;

(3) and the option of offering special classes for their LDA students.

FORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA
(continued)

Los Medanos College
Marin, College of
Mendocino College
Merritt College
Mission College
Modesto Junior College
Monterey Peninsula College
Moorpark College
Mount San Antonio College
Mount San Jacinto College
Napa College
Orange Coast College
Oxnard College
Palomar College
Pasadena City College
Redwoods, College of the
Rio Hondo College
Riverside City College
Saddleback College
San Bernardino Valley College
San Diego City College
San Diego Mesa College
San Francisco, City College of
San Joaquin Delta College
San Jose City College
San Mateo, College of
Santa Ana College
Santa Barbara City College
Santa Monica City College
Santa Rosa Junior College
Sequoias, College of the
Shasta College
Sierra College
Siskiyous, College of the
Skyline College
Southwestern College
Ventura College
West Los Angeles College
West Valley College
Yuba College

---

[a]Formal Programs are defined as having:

(1) an LDA Specialist;

(2) a standard, routine assessment procedure for each student;

(3) and the option of offering special classes for their LDA students.

APPENDIX D

INFORMAL LDA PROGRAM SITES

INFORMAL PROGRAMS FOR LDA STUDENTS IN CALIFORNA COMMUNITY COLLEGES[a]

East Los Angeles College
Feather River College
Golden West College
Hartnell College
Laney College
Los Angeles Pierce College
Los Angeles Trade-Technical College
Los Angeles Valley College
Ohlone College
Solano Community College
Victor Vahley Community College
Vista College
West Hills College

[a]Some type of service other than Formal Programming offered for LDA students.

APPENDIX E

SITES WITHOUT LDA SERVICES

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES WITHOUT SERVICES FOR LDA STUDENTS[a]

American River College
Barstow College
Cosumnes River College
Kings River College
Los Angeles Southwest College
Merced College
Mira Costa College
Palo Verde College
Porterville College
Sacramento City College
Valley Campus

---

[a]No special services provided for LDA students.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES
96 POWELL LIBRARY BUILDING
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024
EE 36

AUG 20 1982